



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,859	02/06/2002	John R. Desjarlais	16380-003001	2777

7590 09/07/2007
J. Peter Fasse
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin St.
Boston, MA 02110-2804

EXAMINER

SIMS, JASON M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/07/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/071,859

Applicant(s)

DESJARLAIS, JOHN R.

Examiner

Jason M. Sims

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-18,32,44,48-62 and 64-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17,18,32,44,63,69 and 70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-18,32,44,48-62 and 64-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 16 and 48-71 in the reply filed 4/19/04 is acknowledged. Claim 72 is also considered elected for the reasons set forth by applicant in the reply. Applicant's further election of species A, towards natural amino acid sequences and species B, genetic algorithms in the reply filed 9/28/2006 are acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 17, 18, 32, 44, 62, 69, and 70 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/19/04 and 9/28/2006.

Claims 16, 32, 44, 48-62, and 64-72 are the current claims hereby under examination.

Drawings

The drawings received on 6/19/2006 have been accepted and entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 9/12/2002, 12/16/2002, 5/6/2003, 11/24/2003, and 1/9/2004 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, such as in paragraphs [0119] and [0138]. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16, 32, 44, 48-62, and 64-72 are drawn to a process. A statutory process must include a final resulting step of a physical transformation, or produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result (*State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.* CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998), *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications Inc.* (CAFC 50 USPQ2d 1447 (1999))). The instant claims do not result in a physical transformation, thus the Examiner must determine if the instant claims include a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

As noted in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.* CAFC 47 USPQ2d 1596 (1998) below, the statutory category of the claimed subject matter is not relevant to a determination of whether the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result:

The question of whether a claim encompasses statutory subject matter should not focus on *which* of the four categories of subject matter a claim is directed to 9-- process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter--but rather on the essential characteristics of the subject

Art Unit: 1631

matter, in particular, its practical utility. Section 101 specifies that statutory subject matter must also satisfy the other "conditions and requirements" of Title 35, including novelty, nonobviousness, and adequacy of disclosure and notice. See *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1359, 31 USPQ2d 1754, 1757-58 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For purpose of our analysis, as noted above, claim 1 is directed to a machine programmed with the Hub and Spoke software and admittedly produces a "useful, concrete, and tangible result." *Alappat*, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557. This renders it statutory subject matter, even if the useful result is expressed in numbers, such as price, profit, percentage, cost, or loss.

In determining if the claimed subject matter produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, the Examiner must determine each standard individually. For a claim to be "useful," the claim must produce a result that is specific, and substantial. For a claim to be "concrete," the process must have a result that is reproducible. For a claim to be "tangible," the process must produce a real world result. Furthermore, the claim must be limited only to statutory embodiments.

Claims 16, 32, 44, 48-62, and 64-72 do not produce a tangible result. A tangible result requires that the claim must set forth a practical application to produce a real-world result. This rejection could be overcome by amendment of the claims to recite that a result of the method is outputted to a display or a memory or another computer on a network, or to a user, or by including a final resulting step of a physical transformation, if such wording is supported by the instant specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 1631

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 16, 32, 44, 48-62, and 64-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mayo et al. (6,269,312).

The claims are directed to a method for modifying simulation or scoring function parameters the method comprising the steps of: a) applying a protein design cycle to produce a variable amino acid sequence; b) comparing said variable amino acid sequence to at least one natural amino acid sequence and/or conformation; c) modifying the simulation or scoring function parameters to reflect said comparison.

Mayo et al. teaches claims 16 and 72 at Col. 2, lines 23-64, Fig. 1., Fig. 2, col. 7, lines 19-67 – col. 27. Mayo et al. at Col. 2 and Fig. 1, teaches the use of an automated protein design and applying it to variable amino acid sequences. Mayo et al. teaches a using a protein design cycle to optimize a variable amino acid sequence, which reads on applying a protein design cycle to produce a variable amino acid sequence; Mayo et al. at col. 8, lines 28-42 discusses parameters that can be modified during the protein design. Mayo et al. discusses the analysis of the modified protein with respect to the natural protein

Art Unit: 1631

backbone for optimizing the designed amino acid sequence, which reads on comparing said variable amino acid sequence to at least one natural amino acid sequence and/or conformation and modifying the simulation or scoring function parameters to reflect said comparison.

Mayo et al. teaches claims 32, 44, 48-62, and 64-71 at col. 5 – col. 27 and col 30- col. 41. Mayo et al. at col. 8, lines 28-42 discusses systematically altering the secondary structure elements, which modify the function parameters, which reads on a method that is repeated at least once. Mayo et al. at col. 7 discusses selecting a starting backbone protein as claim 49. Mayo et al. at col. 11, lines 33-67 discusses the variable amino acid sequence where some residue positions are variable and other residues are fixed as in claims 50-52. Mayo et al. teaches the use of reference energies in calculating scoring functions as in claim 54. Mayo et al. teaches at col. 37-38 weighting parameters using a genetic algorithm as in claims 55-58 and claim 71. Mayo et al. at col. 18-23 discusses correction factors as in claims 55-58. Mayo et al. at col. 30-41 discusses scoring functions being biased as in claims 59-62 and 64-68.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Sims, whose telephone number is (571)-272-7540.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Marjorie Moran can be reached via telephone (571)-272-0720.

Art Unit: 1631

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

// Jason Sims //

Law A. Claw
Primary Patent Examiner
2/4/04

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3: Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
:9/12/2002,12/16/2002, 5/6/2003, 11/24/2003, 1/9/2004 .